

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action of March 15, 2004, the Examiner allowed claims 46, 48-49, and 51, noting that claims 15-21, 26-29, 34-36, 40-45, and 50 are allowable if rewritten as independent claims. Claim 30 was noted to be allowable if rewritten to overcome the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection set forth in the Action. Claims 1-11, 13, 14, 22-25, 30-33, 37-39, and 47, and 51 were rejected. Claims 30 and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claims 1-2, 5-8, 13-14, 22-23, 31-33, and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima et al., in view of Ando et al. Claims 3-4, 9-11, 24-25, and 37-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima in view of Ando in further view of Mautsch et al.

Claims 1, 22, 30, 47, 48, and 50 have been amended herein. Claims 15, 26, and 49 have been cancelled. Thus, claims 1-11, 13, 14, 16-25, 27-48, and 50, 51 are presented herewith for reconsideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 30 and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded by the Applicant to be the invention. Claim 30 was amended to provide proper antecedent basis.

Claim 50 has also been amended to clarify the structures referenced in the claim. As amended herein, claim 50 reads: “The mounting bracket of claim 48, wherein the free rotation means comprises a fastener engagement means positioned at the inner surface for frictionally engaging a fastener within the free rotation means.” *Supra*. Lines 2-7 of page 10 of the Specification describe the bushing as including one or more protrusions (labeled 52 in Figure 1) which extend from the inner surface of the bushing. The Specification further explains that “[t]he protrusions 52 provide a raised surface which may frictionally engage a fastener (Figure 2) to help retain the fastener within the bushing 40.” *Id.* The text in the specification and the figures clearly support the claim as amended herein, and the Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner next rejected claims 1-2, 5-8, 13-14, 22-23, 31-33, and 47 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima in view of Ando. The Examiner found claims 15 and 26 to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. By this amendment, the limitations of claims 15 and 26 have been incorporated into claims 1 and 22, respectively. Claims 15 and 26 have been cancelled. This renders claims 1-14, 16-25, 27-45 allowable. Claim 47 was amended herein to incorporate a similar limitation to those taken from claims 15 and 26 and added to independent claims 1 and 22. The Applicant believes that this renders claim 47 allowable.

Claim 48 has also been amended herein to include a locking means including a locking tab extending from at least one portion of the attachment means. This limitation closely mirrors those added to independent claims 1, 22, and 47. Claim 49 has been cancelled in light of this amendment. Applicant believes that this amendment renders claims 48 and 50-51 allowable as incorporating the features of the invention found patentable by the Examiner.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If there are any remaining issues preventing allowance of the pending claims that may be clarified by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,


Sally J. Brown
Reg. No. 37,788
Attorney for Applicants

Date: 07/14/04

AUTOLIV ASP, INC.
3350 Airport Road
Ogden, Utah 84405
Telephone: 801/625-4800